THE ANTIDOTE Proved A COUNTERFEIT: OR, ERROR DETECTED, AND Believers Baptism VINDICATED.

Containing

An Answer to a Nameless Author's Book, Entituled, *An Antidote to prevent the Prevalency of Anabaptism.*

By *HERCULES COLLINS* of *Wappin.*

LONDON,

Printed for *William Marshall*, at the Bible in *Newgate-Street*, where is to be Sold Mr *Knowles*'s Exposition on the whole book of the *Revelation*, price bound 2 s. 6 d. And Mr. *Bunyan*'s Works in *Folio*, price bound 14 s. And Mr *Claridges* Looking Glass for Princes, price bound 6 d. And likewise most of Dr. *Owen*'s and Mr. *Beverley*'s Works.

MDCXCIII.

BODLEIANA

THE Preface to the Unbyas'd Reader.

WE *live in a divided and opinionative Age, and mens ſentiments of things, for the moſt part, being as various as their Complexions; Books have their Dooms, according to the different apprehenſions of their Readers. Some Tracts have been applauded more for the Name of the Writers, or Opinion they eſpouſe, than for any ſubſtantial Worth to be found in them: Other are too often rejected and decry'd, becauſe their Authors are not of their Perſwaſion; tho they have* Plain Scripture, *the moſt Authentick Evidence for any Goſpel-Doctrine or Practiſe, to plead for them. Some are the better treated for their Learned and Polite Styles, tho they want that which ſhould give them juſt recommendation, namely,* Truth; *while Other which have it on their ſide, meet with hard uſage; and that (which is to be lamented) from Good Men too, becauſe not ſet off with thoſe* Artificial Embelliſhments, *which gain ſo faſt upon a* Fanciful Generation, *that Rhetorical Paint paſſeth for true Beauty.*

But if thou art ſuch an One, as the Preface calls thee, an Unbyaſt Reader; *One who art fully and ſolely for God, not regarding the Names or Writings of Men, any further than they accord with the* Revealed word of God; *if thou art free to receive Truth, for its own ſake, and reſolveſt to hearken only to him* that ſpeaketh from Heaven; *then may it be hoped,* this Vindication of Believers Baptiſm *will find a cordial Welcome with thee.*

Thou canſt not, if thou haſt read any thing, be wholly a ſtranger to the Controverſy about the Proper Subjects *and* Right Adminiſtration *of Baptiſm, between thoſe that are for* Sprinkling, *or*

Pouring

Pouring *of* Water *upon* Infants, *and those that* Dip *or* Plunge *under Water* the whole Body *of* Professing Believers *only. I do confess on the one hand, 'tis sad to consider what strife there is for Victory; but on the other, I rejoyce to see* Christ and his Truth *Triumph, as they do in* Believers Baptism. *Great has been the Opposition made against this Holy Ordinance; but greater has been the Defence of it. Every Age hath afforded some Testimonies for this Truth, but now we are* incompassed with a Cloud of VVitnesses. *Never was any Point* more fully prov'd or better clear'd *than this has been. That one would think our Opposites should either alter their mistaken Practice, or be wholly silent.*

But since they still go on in their Error, and cease not to argue against this Ordinance, 'tis necessary it should be guarded from the Attempts of its Assailants.

The worthy Author of the ensuing Discourse has Travelled formerly, with good success, in this Field of Controversy; and now with no less, against him who calls his Book, An Antidote to prevent the Prevalency of Anabaptism, *&c. Here thou hast the Cavils and Objections of the Adversary, answer'd; Infants, or little Children prov'd to have no Habitual Faith; the dissolution of the Old Covenant-State demonstrated, and the Infants of Believers to have no Right, as the Seed of such, to Holy Baptism. In a word,* the Antidote is throughly examined, and proved to be a Counterfeit.

I shall add no more, but my hearty recommendation of this Book to thy Reading, *desiring of the Lord, that thou mayst so* Read *as to* Understand, *and so* Understand *that thou mayst* Practice.

London, 20th. *of the* 5th. *Month,* 1698.

Thy Souls well wisher in the Lord our Righteousness.

Richard Claridge.

A Plain and Impartial Inquiry into the Antidote, *and upon Examination found a Counterfeit.*

COULD any have expected leſs then that this Gentleman's Book, in the Body of it, ſhould have anſwered the Title-Page, namely, *Infant-Baptiſm Vindicated*; which indeed proves nothing but a *Bravado*, and flouriſh; for if it be Vindicated, it muſt be either becauſe Chriſt commanded it, or ſome of his Apoſtles practiſed it; ſome commended for its Obſervation, or others reproved for its Neglect; but not one word of all this appears in his whole Diſcourſe: Then how can *Infant-Baptiſm* be *Vindicated*? Alſo he comes as ſhort in the other part of the Title, *An Antidote to prevent the Spreading of Anabaptiſm*, he means *Believers Baptiſm*. Can he ſtop the courſe of the Sun, the ebbing and flowing of the Water? Can he number the Clouds and Stars, or weigh the Wind, and the Fire, or the great Mountains? Then he may anſwer his Title. What! is this Man reſolved to ſet himſelf in a poſture of War againſt God and his Word? Doth he think in this to proſper? Will he endeavour to prevent the ſpreading of that which our Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath given his Miniſters in Commiſſion to ſpread? He ſeems to be grieved at our Tranſlation of a Book concerning Baptiſm, from *Engliſh* into *Welch*; but if this be to be *Vile*, we ſhall be *more Vile*. What can be expected when a Man ſhall be an Advocate againſt the Truth?

HE tells us of ſome few Reflections upon ſome remarkable Paſſages in a Book of *H. C.* of *Wapping*. What ſhould be the Reaſon this Gentleman did not anſwer that Book? He hath not ſaid any thing to the Argument of it; but pickt a little here, and a little there, which he thought he could deal withal; but the Argument of the Book is untoucht. He calls them, *a few Reflections*; he may well call them *a few*; for in 139 Pages he hath not ſpoken to as much Matter as Three Pages contain. As for Argument, in his Book, it is ſo little, that I was dead to the anſwering of it a long time, not fearing his making many Proſelytes to *Pedo-baptiſm*, nor hinder the ſpreading of the Truth, tho he did his Endeavour; but the Book being ſo full of Scurrility, baſe and abuſive Language, and he being, as it is to be feared, blinded with Prejudice, when he wrote it, could not ſee his Evil; therefore theſe few Lines are intended, in the room of an Oculiſt, to open his Eyes to behold his Error in Judgment

and Practice, before he leaves the World. I have in my Book laid down several Arguments to prove the right Mode or Manner of the Administration of Baptism to be by *Dipping*, not *Sprinkling*, and that the Subjects are to be *Understanding Believers*, not *Ignorant Infants*. I have spoken to above 20 Objections, but he doth not pretend to give the least Answer to either, what should be the Reason that he did not take Paragraph by Paragraph, and answer it fairly, like a man of Sence and Reason? Some are ready to argue thus, and they cannot help it; It is either because he could not, or would not: Not because he would not, for that would argue little warmth for his own way, yea, a kind of betraying his Cause. I will conclude he is more true to his own Principle; therefore some say *Ergo*, in the Negative, he could not; but if he can, the Press is yet open for him, or any other: and if he be conscious to himself he cannot respond to it, let him fall in with the Counsel therein given.

AS for the Eight Queries, they are reducible to Five, because the 4th, 7th and 8th, are all of one import. As for the *major* part of those Queries, they affect not us; only he makes a Man of Straw, and fights with it, or his own shadow. 'Tis certainly an Argument of profound Confidence, for a man to pretend to the World the discovery of the Errors of a People whose Principles he knows no more, comparatively, than I know *Utopia*; or else why doth he begin with this question, *Whether it be possible for children dying in their Infancy, to be saved*? But if it be not from Ignorance, then it is from a worse Root; for it's apparent enough that he labours to insinuate unto the world, as if we imagined no Infants dying in their Infancy unbaptized could be saved; but if his Book were well considered, he rather deserves *Austin*'s Title, the hard Father of Infants. Now, tho I know none of another mind, but that Children must stand in the Day of Judgment before God's Tribunal, yet his Topicks and Mediums, I think, are not sound to prove it by: He quotes a Text which tells us, *That every person shall be judged according to his Works*. This Text cannot affect little Infants, which have no Works, good nor bad. Was the Scripture written for the sake of Infants, or the Adult? Was not this written to the end Men should look to their Works, that they might give a good Account. It is well this Man is not the Peoples Eyes, for if he were, I fear they would be all quickly with him in the Ditch of Error: What! because *Rev.* 20. 12. saith, *I saw the dead small and great stand before God*; that therefore *the Small* here are *little Infants*. The latter is exegetical of the former, every one being judged according to his Works, argues, That *the small* are either the poor opposed to the rich in the world, or those not come to the perfection of Men, in opposition to them which were, yet knew good and evil, so were judged every one according to his Works. *Those in this Text are judged according to their Works; but little Infants have no Works, good nor bad; therefore they cannot be here intended.*

THE

THE second Query is, *Whether Infants are saved by any other way than by Faith in the Imputed Righteousness of Christ?* In page 5. he asserts Infants are saved by Habitual Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; That Infants are saved by Christ, we have asserted, because we know of no other Name but *Jesus*; but that they are saved by Faith; Habitual Faith in Christ; I must confess I never read it in all the Book of God; I wish he could shew me the Chapter where Christ said any such thing, That Infants are Saved by Habitual Faith. What! would this Man make a New *Bible*, have a new Rule to tell us of things never heard of? Had he the Notion by Inspiration he should have told us so. Now I do not wonder the man is so well pleased with an unscriptural Baptism, when he asserts an unscriptural way of saving Infants; and yet this Gentleman will adventure to prove this in such a way, and by such Topicks and Mediums, that both the Universities could hardly ever think of; for he brings, to make good this *Thesis*, all those Scriptures which speak of the absolute necessity of the Adult, of Men and Womens Regeneration, and believing, and applies them all unto little Infants; as that in *Mark* 16..16. *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.* (We have not left out the latter part of the Words now, for I remember the false charge.) But to this Text in *Mark*, when Christ gave a Commission to his Apostles to go *into all the World to preach the Gospel*, and to inform them, *If they believed, and were baptized, they should be saved; but if they believed not they should be damned*; were they to preach this to little Infants? That they were to believe upon the penalty of Damnation; (I do not say, *baptized upon the penalty of Damnation*, tho you have unwarily asserted some of us are like the *Jews in Judea*, who asserted no Circumcision no Salvation, so no Baptism no Salvation.) But to our business, it seems Ministers are bound to go into the World, and preach to Infants as well as the Adult, that they believe upon the penalty of Damnation; for this is the great Text brought once and again for Infants Baptism, because they have faith; but how came they by it? was it by hearing the word preached, according to the Commission in that place? No, no, saith the good man, 'tis habitual Faith inspired. Why then doth he bring this Text? because he is almost at his Wits end, and famished for want of Arguments, and so will catch at any thing.

PRAY take one argument to think on before we go further, *If none are here intended in* Mark 16. *but Men and Women Capable to Hear, and actually to Believe the Gospel of Christ, then Infant Habitual Faith is not here intended*; but the former is true, therefore the Latter (you see the mans great Bullwark is thrown down at once.) It is a wonder to me that a man who hath been so long a profest Christian should be so long ignorant of the word of God; what was the Scripture Calculated and written for? to be preached to them? why then did he not carry his children when Infants to hear the word? if he saith no, the Gospel was not

written for Infants, why then doth he bring that Text that hath no manner of relation to Infants, but only to the Adult? You are in the pound, Sir, get out if you can. Then he comes with a home queſtion; *But may ſome ſay how ſhall we know that Infants have habitual faith?* How ſhall we know it indeed? for my part I cannot tell how, I wiſh this Gentleman could tell me; for he hath oftentimes aſſerted no Faith no Salvation, neither for Old or Young. But how do you think he Anſwers this queſtion? by asking another, and as weakly anſwering it; *How do we know any children*, ſaith he, *are ſaved but by the Judgment of charity*, and *ſome Scriptural Intimations*? Ah, poor man, this had been better in then out, by ſome Scriptual Intimations: pray give us ſome Scriptual Intimations that Infants have faith, and we will ſay no more. Your bringing a Prophecy of Chriſt out of the 22 *Pſalm* 9, 10. will not do it, and though I give you all you can deſire that it may alſo be applied unto *David*, it ſignifieth nothing to the point; *Thou didſt make me hope when upon my mothers breaſts*; that is, thou didſt give me ſufficient ground for hope and truſt if I had been capable of acting that grace and *v.* 10. *I was caſt upon thee from the womb, thou art my God from my mothers belly*; that is, *I was like one forſaken by his parents and caſt wholly upon thy Providence*; ſee our late Annotations. But for all this Infants have habitual Faith, ſaith our Antagoniſt, but his arguments are ſo feeble that maintain it, that it's like a tottering Fence; well, but what if I ſhould ask, what do you mean by Habitual Faith? I think there cannot be leſs in the word than this, that they have an Inclination to believe, and that they have Power, Might, Ability to believe; and if it be ſo, what is the reaſon they do not believe? ſurely if they have Power, Strength and Ability to believe, is it not reaſonable they ſhould be damned if they do not believe? which are his own words, page 17 *no Faith*, no *Salvation neither for Young nor Old*. If by *Habit* he meant an Inclination to believe, a diſpoſition to believe, then let him prove they have ſuch a diſpoſition; and what it is that hinders their believing; we ſay a perſon that is diſpoſed to a thing, hath power actually to do it. If he do not underſtand the meaning of the word habitual, why did he write it? was it to confound the Ignorant with the word Infant-ſeed of believers being in Covenant; what is meant by being in Covenant? there are thouſands of themſelves know nothing of it. Seeing they do not mean the Election of Grace, for my part I think Tranſubſtantiation, habitual Faith, and the Infant ſeed of believers in the covenant are terms equally allowable and probably equally underſtood among their various Profeſſors; this habitual Faith in Infants is much of the likeneſs of our Athenian aſſertion, that Infants have faith *Potentia*, tho not *Actu viſibli*; ſo you ſay they have habitual, though not actual viſible Faith; for my part I think it calls for a prodigious Faith for any man to believe Infants have faith *potentia*, or habitual; all you have done is only begging when you ſhould have been a digging: But I think you have given away your Cauſe, and habitual Faith too, in page 26. in theſe words, *God is a free Agent, and beſtows his Gifts of Grace*

and

and Mercy upon whom he pleaſeth. May not an earthly King beſtow his bounty upon a poor dumb Cripple that can neither ask nor go to him for it, no, nor return him vocal thanks? Is not this to allow and ſay what I have ſaid, That Infants are happy through the imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt; tho as poor dumb Cripples that can neither ask nor go, nor return thanks? So that tho in effect he ſaith, as I do, yet calls my Sentence a ſtrange Sentence, which aſſerts Infants ſins are done away by the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, page 18. And would any man, but one void of common ſenſe urge ſuch Scriptures for Infant inherent Faith, as *Rom.* 3. 26. *God is the juſtifier of him that believeth in Jeſus,* Eph. 2. 8, 9. *By Grace are ye ſaved through Faith, not of works, leſt any man ſhould boaſt,* Gal. 3. 22. *But the Scripture hath concluded all under ſin, that the promiſe by Faith of Jeſus Chriſt might be given them which believe.* And Mark 16. 16. *He that believeth, and is baptiſed, ſhall be ſaved.* And Gal. 6. 15. *For in Jeſus Chriſt neither circumciſion nor Uncircumciſion availeth any thing, but Faith which worketh by Love, or a new Creature.* And he might as well have added, 1 Cor. 7. *But the keeping of the Commands of God,* Rom. 5. 1. *being juſtified by Faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt,* Rom. 3. 28. *Therefore we conclude a Man is Juſtified by Faith without the deeds of the Law.* Doth this man think in his Conſcience that ever theſe things were written or Preached unto Infants, or in any ſenſe intended that Infants ſhould have the comfort of it; if not, why are all theſe Scriptures applyed unto them, when God never intended it for them? I hope he hath been taught better to Expound the Scripture; But ſtill he poſitively aſſerts Infants have Faith, and do believe, and proves it by two Infallible Witneſſes, as he thinks, the one is Mark 9. 42. *And who ſo ſhall offend one of thoſe little ones which believe in me, it were better for him a milſtone were hanged about his neck and caſt into the Sea.* Theſe little ones he aſſerts are Infants; but I would fain know, had I a mind to offend a believing Infant, how ſhould I know which were him? There is no more appears in one Infant than another. Secondly, Men muſt know ſuch a one which owns Chriſt, for it is becauſe he owns Chriſt that any of the wicked offend him: But how ſhall I know the Infant with his Inherent Grace and Faith, what Family he is in, where he dwells, ſhould I have a mind to offend him? Again, how ſhall the Infant know I am offended with him for his believing in Chriſt? Mark, Reader, the verſe before, *Whoſoever ſhall give a Cup of Water to drink in my Name, becauſe they belong to Chriſt, ſhall not loſe his reward.* Then the next words are, *And whoſoever ſhall offend one of theſe little ones which believe in me.* So that you ſee theſe little ones Chriſt ſpeaks of, are ſuch as go under the notion of Chriſt's Diſciples, making a viſible profeſſion; and if we do the leaſt kindneſs for them we ſhall not loſe our reward. But how ſhall I know which Infant it is that hath habitual Faith, that ſtands in need of this Cup of Water? It cannot diſcover its own thirſt, and ſo the poor Infant may Die, though I had a mind to relieve it. The

Eghteenth

Eighteenth of *Matthew*, is brought in by Christ upon the same account to abate the pride of the Disciples who were discoursing who should be greatest and be the highest in Heaven; upon this Christ calls a little Child, and tells them, except they were Spiritually what that Child was Naturally, in Meekness, Humility, free from Revenge and Pride, *They could not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* So he goes on, *whoso shall offend one of those little ones which believe in me*; not the little Infant or Child called and set in the midst, but those Believers that were like them in Humility, wrought by Faith in Christ; for had I a mind to please or displease an Infant with his habitual Faith, I know not where to find him; and surely our Lord did not speak of such who were never like to be known: Oh, when will you cease to pervert the right word of the Lord? How disingenuous are you in saying, I owned they were Infant-Children, but would not own they believed? My speaking those words was not from those Scriptures, but two others, namely, *Luke* 18. and *Matt.* 19. See my book, page 35. 36. where Children were brought to Christ to be touched; from whence some infer they were Baptized. But I need not wonder you are so unfair with me, when you are so with the very Word of God, when God saith, *Acts* 16. 34. *That the Jaylor believed in God with all his House*; you positively say, here we read of none but the Jaylor which did believe, and yet notwithstanding, say you, his whole Family was Baptized. I hope, Sir, you believe there is a Judg. Mr. *Charnock* speaking of an Habit, tells us, 'It is an inward Frame enabling one to *Act* readily and easily, as when an 'Artificer hath the habit of a Trade; the new Creature consists in gracious qualities and habits, which beautify and dispose the Soul to act 'righteously and holily: Hence habits are as Seeds which make the 'Earth capable to bring forth good Fruit; but what good Fruit hath an 'Infant with all his habitual grace? This habit, saith he, is expresst by a 'fountain of Living Water springing up to Eternal Life. Page 75. 'Some say indeed that Regeneration is conferred in Baptism upon the 'Elect, and exerts it self afterwards in Conversion; but how so active 'a principle as a Spiritual Life should lie dead or a sleep so long, even 'many years, which intervene between Baptism and Conversion, is not 'easily Conceivable. Where these habits are, there is a Spirit of Love, 'of Grace, whereby as their understandings are possest with a know-'ledg of the Excellencies of his ways, so their wills are seasoned by the 'power of this Habit: And further, as Christ had a Body prepared 'him to do the work of a Mediator, so the Soul hath a habit prepared 'to do the work of the new Creature, as the corrupt Nature is the ha-'bit of sin, so the new Nature is the habit of Grace; God doth not on-'ly call us to Believe, Love, Obey, but brings in the Grace of Faith 'and Love and Obedience; this habit receives various Denominations, 'either from the Subject, or Object, 'tis subjectively in the Essence of the 'Soul; but as it shows it self in the Understanding 'tis called the know-

'ledg

'ledg of God; as 'tis in the Will, 'tis a choice of God; as in the Affecti-
'on, 'tis a motion to God; and from the Object it is diversified; as it closes
'with Christ Dying, 'tis Faith; as it rejoyces in Christ Living, it is Love;
'as it lies at the Feet of Christ, it is Humility; as it observes the Will of
'Christ, it is Obedience; as it submits to Christ afflicting, it is patience; as
'it regards Christ offended it is grief; yet all ariseth from one habit; but
'where doth any of these things appear in the Infants habitual Faith; he
'tells you further, where the habit of true Grace is, there is a ready dis-
'position to every good work, because Seminally in every renewed per-
'son.—And, saith he, as 'tis ready in respect of disposition, so it is in
'the activity of motion; yea, 'tis naturally active according to its divine
'Nature, moreover 'tis voluntarily active, where these habits are there
'is a kind of natural necessity of motion from life and habit; yea 'tis
'fervently active, the nobler the Being of any thing is, the greater de-
'gree of activity it is attended with; yea, 'tis unboundedly active, also
'powerfully active, easily active, and pleasantly active, the entire incli-
'nations of the Soul stands right to good actions. Mr. *Charnock*, 2 vol.
'page 85. to 94. Now let all those Characters of Habitual Grace be put
'together, and then consider whether any of these things can affect little
'Infants. I hope by this time you have enough of Infants Habitual
'Faith. I will only add this further, page 94. There is in this habit an
'orderly motion and activity, and a permanent activity, a Spring of per-
'petual motion, even unto everlasting Life; how then can all the In-
'fant Seed of Believers have this Habitual Faith, when so many of
'them make their Parents Hearts to ake? This is like Mr. *Mar-
shall's* Notion in his Sermon before the Parliament, God doth Seal the
Infant presently, and puts their name into the Deed, and that God ac-
cepts of such a Seal on their parts as they are able to give in their Infant
age, expecting a further Ratification when they come to riper years, and
that in the mean time affords them the favour of being in Covenant with
him; and that the surety of the New Covenant is pleased to be their
surety, yet saith, when grown men, they may refuse to stand to this Co-
venant and nullify all: Oh amazing! How inconsistent is this with per-
severance? Take this Argument for a close of your second Query, and An-
swer it, *Those Children of Believers which Die in an Unregenerate
State, either never had the Habits of Grace, or else if they had them, they
have lost them; But there is no losing Habits of Grace*; Ergo, *they ne-
ver had them.* If you say they had them, and have lost them, that
is against your own principle about perseverance: If you say they never
had them, then you contradict your own Book, which asserts, That
all the Infants of Believers have it, and therefore you Baptize them:
get out of this Prison as well as you can.

FOR your third Query, What if I allow all Believers are wholly
passive in Regeneration, and can no more Regenerate themselves, than
a rough Stone can form it self into the Image of a Monarch. What is
all this to your purpose? Doth it follow from hence that Infants have

Faith;

Faith? Is this a concluding Argument? Surely no; Pray Sir go to School and learn better Logick, for this is no Argument in *Barbara*; There is no more, say you, in Children to hinder Grace, than in the Adult: *Ergo, they believe, (what think you Sir, is this good Arguing) Christ can raise of stones Children unto* Abraham, *Ergo, stones believe*, or Stones are wholly passive, and have nothing to hinder Regeneration, *Ergo*, Stones are Regenerated; When you bring better Topicks and Mediums to prove your Argument by, more may be said to it; but you may think I have said too much to discover your Ignorance of Divine things already. Here we may give a hint to your fifth Query, *Whether Children may not have the Golden Oyl of God's Free Grace, as well as Adult persons? Answer, What little Infants have, or what they may have, lieth not within our Sphere*; secret things belong unto God, Revealed things unto us; but the question is, how this Gentleman will prove that infants have this grace which qualifieth them for Baptism; my neighbour is capable of being King of *Utopia*, *Ergo* he is king of *Utopia*, doth this Conclude? the Scripture saith Men and Women ought to believe who are capable of knowing good and evil; therefore infants do believe who know neither good nor evil. Your 4th, 7th, 8th. Queries look one way, and we do assert infants may be fit for the Kingdom of God, as our Lord hath said; and yet not qualified for Gospel Ordinances: Can it be shewed that ever our Lord Instituted Gospel Ordinances for Infants? Could it be made appear that Infants have Repentance, Faith, and are taught of God, have the answer of a good Conscience professedly, they would have a Right to the Ordinance of Baptism; but this Logick will never pass the Schools. My Child shall be heir to my Inheritannce, ergo, he is capable of understanding the signing and sealing of it at eight days old; had you said he had been capable of understanding the sealing this Estate over unto him at One and Twenty, it had carried more of Truth and Reason in it. Why are Children denyed the Lords supper if fit for baptism? what, are Children believers, and kept from the Lord's Table? do we ever read it was denied to a true Believer? what, are Children New Creatures, Regenerated, Born again, and deny them the Elements of Bread and Wine: Oh! hard Father of Infants, Men as wise as your self gave Infants the Eucharist for several hundred years, from some of your own Topicks, and will you deny it them: all your long harangue about Infants being capable of one Ordinance, and not of another, is but wind; will you say in the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, there must be inherent Grace, and also Grace exercised; but a state of Grace, tho not exercised, say you, is sufficient for Baptism; But how doth this Gentleman know Infants are in a state of Grace to qualifie them for Baptism? the word doth not help him here, and if he conclude so from Charity, then there is the same reason to have the same Charity for Children of Unbelievers, and more too some times, because the Believers Child often falls from a pretended Covenant, State, Faith, Inherent Holiness, New Birth, Regeneration, when the Unbelievers,

believers Child abides in all Truly. But how comes this Gentleman so bold as to Assert and Print, That Actual Grace is not necessary to Baptism? Did not *Philip* call for Actual Grace of the *Eunuch* before Baptism? If thou Believest thou mayest: *How then can Persons be wholly Passive in Baptism? Did the Eunuch go down into the Water, and come up out of the Water? Did Christ go almost Forty Miles to be Baptised, and did it as an Act of Righteousness, and yet wholly Passive?* If you can shew me another Bible where Christ since hath said, Persons need not Actual Faith, and are wholly Passive in Baptism, I may change my mind. Whereas he doth Magnify the Lord's Supper so much above Baptism; I do Assert what ever is Sealed to a Believer in one Ordinance, is Sealed to him in another; nay, there is more particular words of Incouragement added unto Baptism, than to the other: 'Tis true, 'tis all comprehended in this, *This is my Body broken for you*, and *my Blood shed for the Remission of your Sins*; but for Baptism in *Acts* 2. you have the promise of *Remission of Sins and gift of the Holy Ghost*: In *Acts* 22. 'tis said *to Wash away Sins Symbolically*, Mark 16. *Salvation is annexed unto Faith and Baptism*; the Lord's Supper was never so Dignified as Baptism by the Procession of the Holy Ghost; and it is a Symbol of *Regeneration* and *Justification*, Rom. 6. Do I see my Sins Pardoned, my Person Justified, God Reconciled, my Person Sanctified, Heaven assured at the Lord's Supper? I behold the same in Baptism, there I see my Sins Buried in his Grave, as in the other Nailed to his Cross; here I behold my Soul Washed in his Blood, Justified by his Righteousness, Saved by his Death; and is not this a Marriage Feast? And ought I not to have the Wedding Garment now as at the Table of the Lord?

BUT this Gentleman tells me, I have Written several strange Positions; I am not ashamed the World should see them: You must know one of the first Arguments of the Church of *Rome* for Infants Baptism, is, *That it Washt away Origional Sin*: Now because I say in opposition to that, we know a better way to Wash away Original Sin, namely, *The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness*: This is one of my strange Positions. But pray which is most strange, this, or the applying all those Texts, which speak of Regenerated Men and Women unto little Infants, and what they speak of the necessity of Faith in them, to apply it unto Babes, who neither know Good nor Evil.

2dly, ANOTHER strange Position is, because I say, *That as Circumcision was the Door into the Jewish Church, which was National; so Baptism is the Door into the Gospel Church, which is Congregational*: Now this being true in his own Opinion; why should it be a strange Position? Why, Because I will not allow, it came in the room of Circumcision: Cannot I make two Doors to my House, but one must be a Type of another? Or rather, Cannot I pull down my Old

House and Build a New; but my Door of my First House must be a Type of the Door of my last. The Door of God's Gospel-House is larger than the Door of his Legal House; that Door was only large enough for the Jews, and few poor Proselyted Gentiles; but the Gospel Door entertains all commers, *Jews*, *Gentiles*, *Barbarians*, *Sythians*: So that the First Door could not be an Exemplar or Type of the Last; Then only Males were Circumcised; now Males and Females Believing may be Baptised; therefore Circumcision could not be the shadow of Baptism; the Subjects that enter the Door are not the same; one are Ignorant Infants, the other Persons of Understanding. Under the Law the Subjects were wholly Passive, but now Church Members must be Active in the Operations and Acts of Repentance and Faith; not only those called Conformists, but the Non-Conformists also have lost the Door, and the Subject that should enter the Door; for here are they wholly Passive, when they should be Active; so that the very Essence of the Ordinance is lost; here is neither right Form, nor right Subject, and what are they that enter not in by the Door, but climb up and come in some other way into the House?

READER, consider whether this saying of mine be so strange as his, which he hath put in two *Mercuries*, shewing I was not the Author of his Book, which I would not have been for the World: He tells the People, *I was never guilty in Writing nor Preaching of any such Extensive Evangelical Truths*: Is not this a piece of Arrogance with a witness? How hath he exposed his Profession and Name to the World? besides he knows not what my Preaching is, not hath Read, I suppose, a third of what is written; so that he speaks in the dark. And where as he saith, *I never was guilty of Writing or Preaching such things, I hope I never shall.* Again, Is not that a strange Position of his, page 25. Because I say, *John Baptist required*, Matt. 3. *of the Pharises and Sadducees Repentance from dead Works, in order to qualifie them for Baptism and Gospel Church Membership; every Tree*, saith the Text, *that brings not forth good Fruit is hewen down, and cast into the Fire.*

HE from hence concludes, and tells the World, that my judgment is, *That little Infants, because they cannot bring forth good Fruit, must be cut down by the Ax of Divine Wrath, and cast into Eternal Fire*: and saith, *I and my party are for saving Infants, by and for good Works.* Did ever man speak more impertinently, and wrong his Antagonist more unreasonably? What, cannot I speak to the Adult and say, *Unless you Repent you shall all perish*, but I must intend Infants who are not capable of it; *and except you believe, you shall be damned*: And when I say, *He that sows to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption*, but must intend Infants: Surely the Doctrine of the Gospel was never Calculated for Infants; these Lines of his must be Written through Ignorance, Inadvertency or worse; however it was, he ought to do his Neighbour right by a publick Recantation; and

and alſo of that in page 24. where he ſaith, *I ſmell rank of Rome, Popery, and Free Will*, becauſe in my Book I give a reproof to the Seekers who put a ſlight upon the Bleſſed Ordinances. See page 60, 61, 62. I little thought he would have been an Advocate for them. As to my Judgment, about Juſtifying Faith, it is well known both from the Pulpit and from the Preſs; but this is like the reſt of his Writing, who labours all he can to blacken the ways of God, and render the Profeſſors of it as odious as poſſible, or elſe he would never have raked into the Grave of one Godly Miniſter who hath been Dead almoſt twenty Years: He mentions ſeveral who have Apoſtatized from the Truth, *Judas* being one of them, Accumulates the Errors of ſome in Principles, and others in Practice, and jumbles them all together to make the name of a *Baptiſt* Odious; nay, Publiſheth one particular paſſage of a Faithful Miniſter of Chriſt (wherein he ſuppoſed ſome Weakneſs, tho there was none) who is now Living, and an Honourable Perſon in the Church of God, whom he calls a *Paſtor of a Congregation*, page 49. And becauſe we with hold from Infants what Chriſt would not have given them, he tells the World we make *no better of Infants than Dogs*, page 11. *That we have Crafty Poſitions, uncouth Gloſſes, that we mince and limit the Fundamental Doctrine of Mans Salvation*, page 48. Doth he not acquire the name of an Exquiſite Calumniator, when he tells the World, *Some of them are Arminians, ſome Socinians, ſome gone back to Judaiſm, others of them Gormandizers*? page 51. Now Courteous Reader, conſider what dreadful work ſhould we make in the Church of God, if we ſhould Preach and Publiſh in Print the Errors of ſome of the *Pedo-Baptiſts*, both in Principle and Practice; but while we are Mourning under the Evil of others, I hope we ſhall not fall into the ſame our ſelves: He endeavours to make thoſe Hearts ſad God would not have made ſad, by Miſrepreſenting our Opinion to the World, as if we held no Baptiſm, no Salvation; and that we account all *Babylon*, and none of the New *Jeruſalem* but them of our Opinion, and very ſtreight in our Love and Affection: Is not this the Man *David* ſpeaks of, *That Travelleth with Iniquity, Conceived Miſchief, and brought forth Falſhood*? Remember, remember *John Child*, whoſe chief cauſe of Deſparation, was his ſpeaking and writing againſt thoſe very People of God you now do.

NOW I come to your Challenge in your Book, page 12. *I Challenge all the Anabaptiſts in the World to produce but one plain Text of Scripture either in the Old or New Teſtament, from* Gen. 17. *to the very laſt of the Revelations, to prove that ever the Children of Believing Parents were caſt out of Covenant by any Authority from God, and then I will Submit unto them.*

MY fear is, this perſon is ſo prepoſſeſt that all a Man can ſay, tho never ſo much to the purpoſe, it will not be regarded; however, becauſe he hath made ſo fair a promiſe, we will try if we can make him ſubmit; but, pray Sir, do not Anſwer this Book and theſe Arguments as my firſt Book, for I expect a full Anſwer if you Write,

YOUR

YOUR demand is, *That we prove Infants In-covenanting, and the priviledges Children once had with their Parents, repealed.*

THEREFORE that the Covenant of Peculiarity made to Abraham, *and his Natural Seed, as ſuch, is Aboliſhed,* I prove from theſe four or five Arguments following, laid down in ſo many Enthymems.

Argum 1. *THE Natural Branches are broken off, Ergo,* Childrens viſible Incovenanting is Repealed; the Antecedent of this Enthymem is cleared from the Apoſtles Aſſertion, *Rom.* 11. 19, 20, 21. *The Branches are broken off, By the Natural Branches,* without Controverſy is to be underſtood the Natural Seed of *Abraham,* and the breaking off muſt either be meant from a Viſible Church Memberſhip, and External Priviledges thereunto belonging, or the everlaſting Covenant of Grace; it cannot be the latter, becauſe that Covenant is Immutable, therefore it muſt be the former: God ſhewed *Zachariah* the Prophet, Chap 11. 10, 14. upon a Proſpect of the *Jews* Unbelief *in the Meſſiah, and their putting him to Death, that he would take his Staff of Beauty, and his Staff of Bands and break it, to ſignify he would break the Covenant he had made with Iſrael and Judah,* who until this time were accounted the only Viſible People of God in the World, tho now the Partition Wall is broken down, and all the Gentile Nations in the World are with the Believing Jews, all one in Chriſt. Hear worthy Mr. *Cotton* on the Covenant, page 15. 'John Baptiſt's Miniſtry, ſaith he, did burn like an Oven againſt all the Scribes and Phariſes, and left them neither the Root of *Abraham's* Covenant, nor the Branches of their own good Works, *Matt.* 3. 9. In the Preface to Dr. *Owen's True Nature of Goſpel Church,* he ſaith, 'God took that numerous 'Progeny which came from *Abraham's* Loyns to himſelf in one Viſible 'Body and Viſible Church Memberſhip. 'The whole Nation being 'the ſame Politick Eccleſiaſtical Body, ſaith Mr. *Tombes,* which Church ſtate was only Carnal, as their Ordinances were; but, ſaith the Preface, 'when God had divorced that People, Aboliſhed their Moſaical Con'ſtitution by breaking their *Staff of Beauty and Bands*; then he erects his 'Goſpel Church, calls in Diſciples by his Miniſtry, forms them into a 'Body, and furniſheth them with Officers; ſo that this Covenant is taken up by the Roots, and the Natural Branches broken off, none excepted, but the Natural Branches which remain ſo by Faith in the Meſſiah, and ſo they broken off, may be Grafted in again; but until then, they remain broken off, *ergo,* the Viſible Incovenanting of Infants is Repealed, for they could not be broken off the Everlaſting Covenant of Grace, therefore it muſt be the Covenant of Pecularity made with *Abraham.*

Arg. 2. *NONE are Chriſt's Diſciples but ſuch as take up his Croſs and follow him,* ergo, *Infants are not Diſciples, and ſo no Viſible Members of a Goſpel Church.*

The Antecedent is fully proved from our Saviours Aſſertion, *Luke* 14. 26, 27. *If any man come unto me, and hate not his Father and Mother, and Wife and Children, and Brethren and Siſters, yea, and his own Life alſo, he cannot be my*

Diſciple;

Disciple, and whosoever beareth not his Cross, and cometh after me, he cannot be my Disciple, twice repeated, as if our Saviour had foreseen how men would boldly assert Infants Disciples who were wholly uncapable of it. Let this put you to everlasting Silence from mentioning *Matt* 28.18. your great Bulwark you always run unto; now you may plainly see our Saviour did not mean Children, when he said, *go Disciple all Nations*; if he had intended Infants to have been Disciples also, he would have made that exception; but our Lord knew they were in no wise capable of being taught, taking up Christ's Cross and following him, without which it's impossible, saith our blessed Lord, you should be my Disciples. Thus you see that Children are excluded the Commission, because they cannot be Disciples, being wholly uncapable to take up the Cross, and so consequently not Visibly in Covenant, nor Church Members; therefore that Covenant of Peculiarity with *Abraham* and his Natural Seed is Repealed.

Arg. 3. *The Promise of Remission of Sin, and the gift of the Holy Ghost unto the Children of Believers, is upon the terms of Repentance and Obedience,* Ergo, *the Promise is not to the Fleshly and Natural Seed of Believers as such.*

The Antecedent is proved from Gods word, *Acts* 2. 38. 39. where the Jews upon Conviction by St. Peter's Sermon, of their being the Murtherers of the Messiah, cries out unto the Apostle, *Men and Brethren, what shall we do?* Peter *Answers them, Repent and be Baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for this Promise is to you and your Children also, yea, to the very Gentiles afar off, if they are called.* Repent, Believe and Obey the Messiah, for tho you called for the Guilt of Christs Blood to be upon your Heads, and your Childrens, yet for your Comfort it shall not be upon either. If both have these Qualifications before mentioned, therefore the consequent roundly follows that the Promise is not made to the Natural Seed of Believers as such, therefore the Covenant of peculiarity made with *Abraham* and his Seed is Repealed. But if you will not yet comply with this plain sense of the Words, but that the Promise of God in this Text is to the Infant Seed of Believers as such; consider your task; if God hath made such a Promise as Sins Remission, and the Gift of the Holy Ghost to all the Natural Seed of Believers as such, then you are to make this appear that the Believers Infant Seed as such, are indeed Partakers of these Promises which God hath here made, or else you Reflect unfaithfulness on God for non-performance of his Covenant, so that unavoidably all the Infant Seed of Believers, as such, must be Saved, since God hath made the promise of Sins Remission, and the Gift of the Holy Ghost unto them, unless you suppose some may Eternally Perish which have these Gifts; but if you will add, and say, we never believed they should be the better for the Promise, without an Actual taking Hold of the Covenant; then shew us what Promise and Priviledg the Child of a Be-

liever hath, more than the Child of an Unbeliever, or Gentile afar off, if they do also actually take hold by Faith of God's Covenant. Thus you see that the Promise is not to the Fleshly Seed of Believers as such, but upon the terms of Faith and Obedience; therefore the Covenant of Peculiarity made with *Abraham*, and his Natural Seed, is Repealed.

Arg. 4. Abraham's *Seed under the Gospel Dispensation are only Actual true Believers*, Ergo, *the Covenant of Peculiarity made with* Abraham *and his Infant Seed, as such, is Repealed.*

The Antecedent is clear, from *Gal.* 3. 29. *If ye are Christs, then are ye* Abraham's *Seed*; *you boast*, saith Christ, *Abraham is your Father, but you are the Children of the Devil, for ye seek to kill me, so did not* Abraham; *boast not of your Birth Priviledges, it signifieth nothing except you are born again, for the Children of the Flesh, tho the Children of* Abraham, *are not the Children of God, but the Children of the Promise*, viz. *The Children of Faith are counted for the seed*, Rom. 9. 8. The consequent follows naturally, That the old way of Infants Visible Incovenanting is Repealed, unless you think Infants do believe, so that whatsoever was comprehended in that Promise made to *Abraham* and his Seed, *Gen.* 17. 7. can no ways affect the Seed of Believing Gentiles as such: for my Seed, as a Gentile cannot be the Natural Seed of *Abraham*, a Jew; nor the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, because such are reckoned according to the Spirit and Faith; So that that Text, *Gen* 17. 7. hath been very improperly applied all along to the Seed of Believing Gentiles, as such, being neither the Natural nor Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*: And to advance a little further, know this that no particular Believer can infer they are a Holy Root to their Posterity; because *Abraham* is called the Father of the Faithful, for *Abraham* is accounted a Spiritual Father, but we are accounted Natural; So that the Covenant of Peculiarity made with *Abraham* and his Natural Seed, as such, must be Abolished, because we are not accounted *Abraham*'s Seed now, but as we believe in the Messiah, and for a Gentile Believers Natural Seed, as such, cannot be the Seed of *Abraham*, neither in a natural nor Spiritual Sence, therefore cannot in any wise affect them: Here you have brought your self again into a Noose, and I cannot help it. Now seeing the Seed of *Abraham* are Actual Believers, therefore the Covenant of Peculiarity made with *Abraham*, and his Natural Seed is Repealed.

Arg. 5. *Infants are not capable of the Qualifications of Gospel Church Membership*, Ergo, *Infants Incovenanting and Church Membership is Repealed.*

THE Antecedent is clear from their being wholly uncapable of being Taught and made Disciples, by taking up Christ's Cross and following him; also of Self-Examination. In the Covenant of Peculiarity made with *Abraham*; the Infant Church Members were wholly Passive in suffering the sign of the Covenant under the Legal Oeconomy. 'But Members of a Gospel Church are Active; the *Corinthians* gave themselves 'first to God, and then to the Apostles, by the Will of God, in a Church State;

'State; in a Gospel Church they are Innitiated after Conversion, or at 'least a Profession of it: It's said of such, They that gladly received the 'Word were Baptised, and they eat their Meat with gladness and sin-'gleness of Heart, and went to their own Company, lift up their Voice 'in Prayer, and were Obedient to the Faith; but Infant Church Mem-'bership no ways agree to a Gospel Church State, who are said to be 'Sanctified in Christ Jesus, Saints by calling, Holy Brethren, Living 'Stones, Christ's Spiritual Temple, and House of God. Church Mem-'bers, now are to be Active; they are not to go, as *Austin* absurdly saith of Infants going to Baptism with others Feet, believe with others Faith, Covenant with others Tongues. I am sure Christ went upon his own Feet to Baptism near forty Mile, and the Eunuch also, and believed with his own Faith, and Covenanted with his own Tongue. Now for the Conclusion, I say, Infants are not now Visibly in covenant, it not being within my Sphere what they are as to Gods Decrees, yet conclude well of all that Die in their Infant State. But seeing there are so many Qualifications required individually to Gospel Church Membership, your task is to prove, that Infants have them, or give up the Cause, according to your Promise, and confess the Covenant of Peculiarity made unto *Abraham*, and his Seed, is Repealed.

Whereas you mention *Jeremiah* and *John Baptist* Sanctified from the Womb; on *Jeremiah*, our Annotators say, I have Appointed and Approved thee as a fit Minister for the Work, I have Prepared and Ordained thee for Publick Service, *viz.* not with Saving Grace, tho that need not to be excluded; and of *John* the *Baptist*, they say, being filled with the Holy Ghost from his Mothers Womb; this is true both as to Prophecy, which is an extraordinary gift of the Holy Ghost, and also of the Holy Ghost considered as a Sanctifying Spirit: Now consider, our Annotators lay the great stress of those two Men Sanctified from the Womb, upon their being fitted for publick Work, for as much as they had insuperable Difficulties which in those degenerate and corrupt Times they must unavoidably Encounter with; but what if it should be granted those two Men were not only Sanctified from the Womb? That is, set a-part to publick Work, which the word Sanctified sometimes imports; but that also they were Savingly Sanctified in their Hearts: Is this a good Argument to prove, that all the Infant Seed of believers have Habitual Faith from their Mothers Womb? If so, how comes it to pass that so many of them Die unsanctified? Logicians will tell you, its unsafe Arguing from particuliar Instances to generals; is this a good Argument? *Solomon* was a very Wise man, *ergo*, all men are very Wise. *Samson* was a Strong Man, therefore all Men have *Samson's* Strength. *Abraham* was a great believer, therefore all Men have great Faith. *Moses* was a Meek Man, therefore all Men are Meek, and all Men Patient, because *Job* was such; I hope we shall never have these in-

ſtances urged any more of *John Baptiſt*, and *Jeremiah*, for to prove that all the Infant Seed of believers have Habitual Faith.

SEEING ſome have queried, where you find that Children are forbidden to be Baptiſed, tho you know it is rather your work to prove the Poſitive, That there is a Command for the Baptiſing of Infants, than for me to prove the Negative, That there is none; for if you would but prove the former, you would ſave me the Labour from proving the latter; however I ſhall attempt it for once.

TO prove the Baptiſm of Infants forbidden.

ALL poſitive Commands Prohibit whatever is repugnant thereunto; but the Baptiſm of Infants is repugnant to the poſitive command of Chriſt for that Ordinance, *ergo*, the baptiſm of Infants is prohibited.

The Major is undeniable, the Minor I thus prove: If Ignorance be oppoſed to underſtanding, the want of an act of Repentance, Faith and Obedience be oppoſed to the Act, and Teaching be oppoſed to them not capable of it. If a few drops of Water be oppoſed to a burial in Water: In a word, if a wrong Subject and a wrong manner of Adminiſtration be oppoſite to a right Subject and manner of Adminiſtration, then Infants Baptiſm is repugnant to Chriſt's Command for that Ordinance, and therefore roundly Prohibited; for no man of Senſe can imagin that our Lord can allow of any Practice repugnant to his own Commiſſion; the word all Nations, in *Matt.* 28. is referable only to the Teaching of all Nations; all poſitive Commands, prohibit whatever is repugnant thereunto. We might Illuſtrate when we are commanded to Worſhip God in Spirit and Truth, it forbids all Ignorant Devotion, Formallity and Hypocriſy, and when commanded to Worſhip God, all Idols and Idolaty is forbidden; to eat bread and drink Wine in remembrance of Chriſt, forbids a belief of his Corporal Preſence; what need I do any act to put me in remembrance of him who is Corporally Preſent, when God's Word aſſerts we are ſaved by Grace, it forbids Works as Meritorious; ſo when God Commands Perſons that Profeſs Faith and Repentance to to be baptiſed, it Prohibits all that are uncapable of thoſe Qualifications. Take heed of incurring Divine Diſpleaſure, by commanding that in the Name of the Lord, which he never commanded: Oh! what a dreadful Judgment did God threaten againſt *Jeruſalem* for doing thoſe things which God Commanded them not, *In offering their Children to* Molech *in the Valley of* Ben Hinnom, *which I commanded them not*, ſaith God, *neither came it into my mind*, Jer. 19. 5. The *Geneva* Note on that place, ſaith, Whatſoever is not Commanded by God, touching his Service, is againſt God's word, becauſe not commanded: Was not *Nadab* and *Abibu* prohibited falſe Fire when commanded to take Fire from the Altar? Is not *Tertullian's* Notion true, every poſitive Command of Chriſt includes a Negative? by this Argument you may ſet up a great part of the falſe Worſhip in *Rome*, by Interrogating where it is forbidden, read

Matt.

Matt. 28. 18. *Acts* 2. 37. *Mark* 16. 16. *Rom.* 6. 4. *Act.* 8. 36, 37. *Acts* 10. All which Scriptures ſhew, that Infant Baptiſm muſt be Repugnant unto that Baptiſm which is from Heaven, therefore is Prohibited.

Syllogiſtical Arguments againſt Pedo, and for Believers Baptiſm.

Arg. 1. THAT which hath no Divine Command nor Example, none Commended for its Obſervation, nor Reprehended for its neglect, cannot be of God, or Divine Authority; but the Baptiſing of Infants hath no Divine Command nor Example, none Commended for its Obſervation, nor reproved for its Neglect; *ergo*, the Baptiſing of Infants is not of God or Divine Authority.

Arg. 2. THAT which hath a Divine Command and Example, ſome commended for its Obſervation and others reproved for its neglect, muſt be of God and Divine Authority; but the Baptiſm of Believers hath a Divine Command and Example, ſome commended for its Obſervation, others Reprehended for its neglect *ergo*, the Baptiſm of Believers is of God and Divine Authority, *Mark* 16. 15, 16. *Luke* 7. 29, 30.

Arg. 3 THAT which was the Practice of the pure Primitive and Apoſtolick Times, about Initiating perſons into the Church, ought to be the ſame unto the Second Coming of Chriſt: But to Initiate perſons into the Church by Baptiſm, upon a profeſſion of Faith, was the Practice of the pure Primitive and Apoſtolick times; *ergo*, to Initiate perſons into the Church by Baptiſm upon a profeſſion of Faith, ought to be the ſame unto the Second Coming of Chriſt. This Argument doth ſtand Immovable againſt the Churches for *Pedo-Baptiſm*, unleſs they can aſſign the time and place where Chriſt altered the Conſtitution of his Churches, and changed the manner of Initiation into them, or elſe to their Peril be it, who Conſtitute Churches any other way, or Initiate Members contrary to the Apoſtolick Practice.

Arg. 4. THAT which is contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of *John*, *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, is of Human Invention.

BUT the Baptiſm of Infants is contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of *John*, *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, *ergo*, the Baptiſm of Infants is of Human Invention.

FOR the *Minor*; That the Baptiſm of Infants is contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of *John*, *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, the whole New Teſtament Witneſſeth: That the Subjects of this Ordinance were Underſtanding Believers, not Ignorant Infants, and Dipping, not Sprinkling, the manner of Adminiſtration; and therefore the conſequence of the *Major* is true, That Infant Baptiſm is of Human Invention.

Arg. 5. That Practice which hath no Promiſe Annexed unto it, either of Sins Remiſſion, Divine Preſence, the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, nor Salvation, cannot be of God, or Divine Appointment.

BUT *Pedo-Baptism* hath no Promise annexed unto it, either of Sins Remission, Divine Presence, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, nor Salvation, *ergo*, *Pedo Baptism* cannot be of God, or Divine Appointment.

Arg. 6. That Practice in the Church, which hath the Promise of sins Remission, Divine Presence, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, and Salvation annexed unto it, is of God, and Divine Authority.

BUT the Baptism of Believers, upon Profession of Faith, hath the Promise of Sins Remission, Divine Presence, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, and Salvation annexed unto it, *Mat.* 28. 18. *Acts* 2. 38. *Mark* 16. 16. *Ergo*, The Baptism of Believers, upon Profession of Faith, is of God and Divine Authority.

Arg. 7. THAT manner of Administration of Baptism, which no way answers the Commission nor Intention of Christ the Law-maker, cannot be Authentick.

BUT the Administration of Baptism by Sprinkling, Pouring or Dropping, doth no way answer the Commission, nor Intention of Christ the Law-maker, *ergo*, the Administration of Baptism, by Sprinkling, Pouring or Dropping, is not Authentick.

The *Minor* is clear, That the Administration of Baptism, by Sprinkling, Dropping or Pouring, doth no way answer Christ the Law-maker's Commission, because he Commands the Subject to be Dipt, Immersed, Buried; in pursuance of which Command, the Apostles did always so Practice. Secondly, It can no way answer the intention of Christ the Law-giver, because his Intention was, That it should be a lively representation of the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, together with the Believers Death to Sin, and a Resurrection to a new Life, all which appears, *Rom.* 6. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. *Colos.* 2 12. Now what Similitude or likeness is between Sprinkling, and Christ's Death, Burial and Resurrection, I leave to all the Judicious to consider; would Christ take such care to have his Death set forth in Lively Figures at the Lord's Table, in breaking Bread, and pouring out Wine? And would Christ appoint a Dead Figure in Baptism? No, no.

Arg. 8. THAT Baptism which hath manifest Absurdities cannot be of God;

But the Baptism of Infants hath manifold Absurdities, *ergo*, the Baptism of Infants cannot be of God.

The *Minor* is thus proved; It's full of Absurdities, because asserted by some, That persons have Regeneration in their Baptism before Vocation, and may be visible Church Members before Conversion; moreover that persons may be baptised by anothers Faith, and making a National Gospel-Church, instead of a Congregational, and bringing in a Carnal Fleshly Seed into Christ's Church, in the room of a Spiritual Seed.

That Faith and Repentance is required of persons before baptised, yet confess that Children, unto whom they apply it, have neither.

Again,

Again, They profeſs that Baptiſm is a Demonſtration of a Spiritual Marriage between God and the Believer, and yet Aſſign it unto One as uncapable of ſuch a thing as a Stock or Stone: Moreover, that the Baptiſmal Covenant enters into the Viſible Church, yet deny Church Members the Lord's Supper.

Arg. 9. That Baptiſm that Introduceth Groſs Errors into the Church, cannot be Divine, but Human.

But the Baptiſm of Infants introduceth groſs Errors into the Church, *ergo*, the Baptiſm of Infants cannot be Divine, but Humane.

The *Minor* thus appears of its introducing Errors; It was firſt uſed to waſh away Original Sin, which nothing but Chriſt's Blood could do. Again; It's uſed to work Grace and Regeneration, and Effect Salvation by the Work done; and againſt all ſence ſome ſay, It is an Apoſtolical Tradition, and that Children have Faith, are Diſciples of Chriſt, that all Children of believers are in the Covenant of Grace, defiling and polluting the Church with falſe matter, and confounding the Church and the World together, introducing many Traditions and Inventions of Anti-chriſt with it, as Goſſips or Suretſes, Biſhoping or Confirmation, Chriſm, Exorciſm, Conſignation; finally, it hath made a great deal of Contention in the World, and filled many with prejudice.

Arg. 10. The proper Subjects of Baptiſm are ſuch who are capable of hearing the Word, and Teaching, of Repenting, Confeſſing of Sin, believing in Chriſt, and doing it as Chriſt's Commiſſion, a part of Goſpel Righteouſneſs, as Gods Counſel, and as the Anſwer of a good Conſcience, and ought to do it as a Symbol of Chriſt's Death and Reſurrection, together with our own Death unto Sin, and Reſurrection to a New Life, *ergo*, Infants are not the proper Subjects of Baptiſm.

Mr. *Perkins* ſaith, The Greek word ἐπερώτημα, Interrogation, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. of a good Conſcience, ſignifieth a Stipulation or Promiſe which the perſon Baptiſed makes in Baptiſm; and further ſaith, He hath a double Interrogation, one from the Miniſter, which he Conſcientiouſly Anſwers, to perform the things Covenanted; and the other Interrogation is of his Conſcience unto God, whether he will accept him, if he Dedicate himſelf as his Faithful Servant, tho a poor miſerable ſinner? But how can theſe things affect Little Infants? How doth it appear they have the Anſwer of a good Conſcience in Baptiſm?

To Conclude, Courteous Reader, I pray grant me one requeſt, and that is, That you would be pleaſed to take my book of *Baptiſm*, and conſider my Antagoniſt's Anſwer unto it: I alſo deſire you would ſeriouſly compare my Anſwer with his Book, and I hope you will find nothing material left unanſwered, tho he hath not ſpoken to the Matter contain'd in three pages, of one Hundred Thirty and Nine of

my

my Book of *Baptiſm*; pray conſider, if he doth give any Anſwer to my Anſwer, or whether he ſaith any thing to the Arguments or Argumentative part of my Books, and be not put off with Shadows inſtead of Subſtance, nor with a Shell inſtead of a Kernel; for you have Reaſonable Souls, do not therefore ſuffer your ſelves to be impoſed upon to take Braſs for Gold, Non-ſence for Reaſon, nor mens Inventions for Gods Inſtitutions; but like the Noble *Bereans*, ſearch the Scriptures to ſee whether thoſe things be ſo, or no; and believe nothing becauſe I, or any other Man ſaith it, but becauſe Divine Writ affirms it. In ſo doing you ſhall profit your ſelf, and oblige him who wiſheth you Everlaſting Proſperity.

FINIS

Advertiſement.

CHriſt alone Exalted: being the compleat Works of *Tobias Criſp*, D.D. containing XLII. Sermons on ſeveral Sele& Texts of Scriptures: Which were formerly Printed in Three ſmall Volumes, by that late Eminent and Faithful Diſpenſer of God's Word: Who was ſometime Miniſter at *Brinkworth* in *Wiltſhire*; and afterward many of the Sermons were Preached in and about *London*. To which is added Ten Sermons, whereof Eight were never before Printed, faithfully tranſcribed from his own Notes: Which is all that ever will be Printed of the ſaid Doctor's.

The Texts of Scripture of the late Addition are as follow, *viz.*

Serm. I. John xx. 29 *Bleſſed are they that have not ſeen, and yet have believed.*

Serm. II. Rom. viij. 32. *He that ſpared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how ſhall he not with him alſo freely give us all things?*

Serm. III. IV, V, VI. (the Matter being undivided) *Titus* ij. 11, 12. *For the Grace of God that bringeth ſalvation, hath appeared to all men; teaching us, that denying ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, we ſhould live ſoberly, righteouſly, and godly in this preſent world.*

Serm. VII. *Amos* iv. 12. *Becauſe I will do this unto thee, prepare thy ſelf to meet thy God, O Iſrael.*

Serm. VIII. Matt. xvi. 24. *If any man will come after me, let him deny himſelf.*

Serm. IX. *Gal.* iij. 5. *Wherefore then ſerveth the Law? it was added becauſe of tranſgreſſion, till the ſeed ſhould come, to whom the promiſe was made.*

Serm. X. Mr. *Brunſel's* Funeral Sermon, on *Gal.* i. 8.

Bellificium Chirurgiæ: or the Marrow of Chirurgery. An *Anatomical* Treatiſe. *Inſtitutions* of Phyſick, with *Hippocrates's* Aphoriſms largely Commented upon. The Marrow of *Phyſick* ſhewing the Cauſes, Signs and Cures of moſt Diſeaſes incident to humane Bodies. Choice experienced *Receipts* for the Cure of ſeveral Diſtempers. The Fourth Edition, enlarged with many *Additions*, and purged from many *faults* that eſcaped in the former Impreſſions. Illuſtrated in its ſeveral parts with twelve *Braſs Cuts*. By *James Cooke* of *Warwick*, Practitioner in Phyſick and Chirurgery.

Both Printed for *William Marſhall*, at the Bible in *Newgate-Street*.